

## **EPA & Hydraulic Fracturing - Jan. 8**

| <b>Date</b> | <b>HeadLine</b>   | <b>Outlet</b>                       |
|-------------|---|-------------------------------------|
| 01/08/2013  | Matt Damon Film Cheers Pennsylvanians Who Say Fracking Pollutes           | Bloomberg News - Online             |
| 01/08/2013  | Obama holds key to sources of energy                                      | Electric Light and Power            |
| 01/08/2013  | EPA fracking study may dodge some tough questions                         | Tyler Star News - Online            |
| 01/08/2013  | Methane leaking from fracking wells in Colorado and Utah raising concerns | Examiner.com                        |
| 01/08/2013  | EPA fracking study may dodge some tough questions                         | Gloversville Leader-Herald - Online |
| 01/08/2013  | EPA fracking study may dodge some tough questions                         | Yahoo! Finance                      |
| 01/08/2013  | EPA fracking study may dodge some tough questions                         | Wetzel Chronicle - Online           |
| 01/08/2013  | Google hits on the fracking divide  | Electric Light and Power            |

## **EPA & Hydraulic Fracturing - Jan. 8**

**Matt Damon Film Cheers Pennsylvanians Who Say Fracking Pollutes  
Bloomberg News - Online  
New York, NY  
Jim Efstathiou  
01/08/2013**

Some residents of a rural Pennsylvania region at the heart of the natural gas boom say they hope that a Matt Damon film about drilling will return scrutiny to complaints about water pollution rejected by state and federal regulators.

"Promised Land," opened nationwide Jan. 4, including at the Dietrich Theater in Tunkhannock, Pennsylvania. It's the closest showing to the town of Dimock, where residents have drawn national attention with a years-long battle against regulators they claim have failed to hold gas drillers accountable for environmental damage.

The film, produced by a unit of Comcast Corp. (CMCSA)'s NBCUniversal Media LLC, depicts Damon as a gas company employee called a land man. He goes to the fictional town of McKinley to acquire drilling rights from farmers and homeowners. Carol French, who owns a dairy farm in Ulster, Pennsylvania, said she hopes the story will resonate with people who know little of the drilling process known as hydraulic fracturing, or fracking, she blames for spoiling her water.

"Contamination knows no boundaries," French said. "If you don't lease and you're trying to do the right thing, that is not protecting you. Your state is not protecting you. I'm hoping that 'Promised Land' will create a thought and create conversation."

French watched the film's premier in Tunkhannock Jan. 4 with other critics of fracking who say gas drilling has affected their drinking water. Tunkhannock is about 15 miles south of Dimock, a community at the center of the debate over the potential impact of fracking on well water.

After the Pennsylvania Department of Environmental Protection determined that Cabot Oil & Gas Corp. (COG)'s drilling "affected" 18 drinking-water wells, the company agreed to provide the families with fresh water, install filters and pay twice the value of their homes. Its sampling found the water there was safe, and, after some residents refused to settle, it cut off water deliveries in 2011.

The U.S. Environmental Protection Agency supplied water until July when it said its own tests of water wells near a gas drilling operation found no unsafe levels of contaminants. Cabot, based in Houston, maintains that its operations haven't contaminated homeowners' wells in Dimock. George Stark, a company spokesman, did not return a call seeking comment on "Promised Land."

Ray Kemble calls Dimock "ground zero" and counts about 40 gas wells within a mile of his home and auto repair business there. On the day he was told his water was safe, Kemble said EPA officials declined to drink from his well.

"Promised Land" will make it harder for drillers to take advantage of people, Kemble said.

"It should have had a little bit more of a punch," Kemble said. Still, "it's going to make people that have never seen or dealt with a land man come out of the theater and go 'ooh.' And they're going to have questions if a land man comes knocking on their door."

Fracking and horizontal drilling have allowed companies to tap gas in deep rock formations in Pennsylvania, Ohio and Colorado. The processes have boosted local economies and spurred manufacturing growth across the U.S. because of lower gas prices.

"This film is purely a work of fiction and is not reflective of the work our industry undertakes," Steve Forde, a spokesman

## **EPA & Hydraulic Fracturing - Jan. 8**

for the Marcellus Shale Coalition, a Pittsburgh-based industry group, said in an e-mail. "We live and raise our families in these communities and have an unmatched commitment to protecting our air, water and environment."

The movie was filmed partly in western Pennsylvania though the state where the town of McKinley is located is not identified.

The industry, in a bid to head off criticism about fracking that might follow "Promised Land," bought advertising time in 75 percent of Pennsylvania theaters for a pre-buttal of the film. The on-screen ad lasts 16 seconds and refers the audience to an industry-sponsored website, [www.learnaboutshale.org](http://www.learnaboutshale.org), for "a community conversation on natural gas." The ad, sponsored by the Marcellus Shale Coalition, did not appear before the screening in Tunkhannock.

On Route 29 between Dimock and Tunkhannock the signs of the natural gas boom are everywhere. Rig workers fill local restaurants at lunch while trucks hauling drilling wastewater or heavy equipment are an ever present sight on the two-lane road.

A turn onto almost any smaller, local road reveals well pads and staging areas for drilling operations. Backhoes are at work digging trenches for new pipelines to deliver the gas.

"This gas industry coming to our area has changed how we operate," French said. "It's changed our families, changed our communities."

The film, directed by Gus Van Sant, pits Steve Butler (played by Damon) against Dustin Noble, an environmentalist played by John Krasinski (Jim Halpert in the television series "The Office"). Butler, who uses cash bribes and hard-sell tactics to acquire drilling rights, is himself unaware of the extent his employer will go to to achieve its goals.

"Promised Land" took in \$4.3 million this past weekend in the U.S. and Canada, placing it 10th in box office receipts behind films such as "Texas Chainsaw 3D," which took in \$23 million, and "Django Unchained," which had sales of \$20.1 million.

Even with its Hollywood ending, "at least it's putting attention on the evil" side of the business, said Sheila Russell, an organic farmer in Rome, Pennsylvania. "At least it's showing that part."

Towns in northeast Pennsylvania were among the first in 2006 to be approached by gas drillers seeking to tap into the Marcellus Shale, a rock formation deep underground stretching from New York to West Virginia that the U.S. Energy Department estimates may hold enough gas to supply the U.S. for about six years.

Without the benefit of "Promised Land" and "Gasland," a 2010 Academy Award-nominated documentary that criticized fracking, it was too easy for drillers to secure leases that took advantage of property owners, Russell said.

Critics of fracking, in which millions of gallons of water are mixed with sand and chemicals to blast apart underground rock formations and free trapped gas, say it has spoiled water and polluted air in scores of rural communities. Supporters say fracking doesn't pollute water and cheap gas has supplanted coal in power production, reducing greenhouse gas emissions.

In the film, Butler uses hard-sell tactics to close drilling deals with people who are expecting to become millionaires. Mike Knapp, a land man for MDS Energy Development LLC, in western Pennsylvania, rejects the caricature and says he runs into high-school classmates or parents of his friends when he offers leases.

"We aren't some company coming out of Texas," Knapp said in an interview. "We were all born here and raised here."

## **EPA & Hydraulic Fracturing - Jan. 8**

Russell said Damon's character only hints at the tactics used in real life. She recalled how in 2006, a gas company land man approached her elderly father with an offer to renew a long- standing agreement to allow mineral production on the family property.

"When my dad signed and re-upped for \$5 an acre, there was no mention of hydrofracking," Russell said. "They came out to these depressed farms and took advantage of 80-year-old men like my father with a big smile on their faces."

To contact the reporter on this story: Jim Efstathiou Jr. in New York at [jefstathiou@bloomberg.net](mailto:jefstathiou@bloomberg.net)

To contact the editor responsible for this story: Jon Morgan at [jmorgan97@bloomberg.net](mailto:jmorgan97@bloomberg.net)

Scott Green/Focus Features/Courtesy Everett Collection

From left, John Krasinski, director Gus Van Sant and Matt Damon on the "Promised Land" film set.

From left, John Krasinski, director Gus Van Sant and Matt Damon on the "Promised Land" film set. Photographer: Scott Green/Focus Features/Courtesy Everett Collection

# **EPA & Hydraulic Fracturing - Jan. 8**

## **Obama holds key to sources of energy Electric Light and Power**

**01/08/2013**

America's energy outlook this year will be, more than ever before, tied to how the federal government approaches the issue of climate change - and how much leverage the new Congress will have to help or hinder those efforts.

Many of President Obama's supporters expect real action. Although it's unlikely that a federal carbon tax or a revived "cap-and-trade" pollution-control system could be implemented - House Republicans will have none of it - the administration and its environmentalist allies still have cards to play. Congress will have some say in what happens to American fossil-fuel production, subsidies for wind and solar power and other key energy matters, but most of the important decisions will be made in the White House.

Chief among those is whether to approve the Keystone XL pipeline, a massive Canada-to-Texas project that backers say could transform North American energy markets but one that many environmentalists see as a major concession in the larger fight to reduce carbon emissions.

That is a fight that many expect Mr. Obama to embrace in his second term.

"We're confident that he's going to tackle it. He's had a very good start," said Josh Saks, legislative director for the National Wildlife Federation's advocacy center, citing the administration's drive to improve auto fuel standards and other steps taken in the name of fighting climate change in his first term.

"The carbon [issue] is the big enchilada for us right now. We're going to make sure that the president pays attention to this," Mr. Saks said.

Although the Keystone project may be the highest-profile energy fight this year, the administration is poised to ratchet up its regulatory agenda in other areas, though it first must fill a key vacancy on its policy team.

### **A new EPA head**

Mr. Obama has not nominated a permanent replacement for Environmental Protection Agency Administrator Lisa P. Jackson, who recently announced that she would be stepping down after the president's State of the Union address this month.

She has led what many on the left consider a successful four-year term, but also has encountered several major embarrassments, including an ongoing investigation in her use of secret email accounts.

Whoever takes over the agency, one thing is certain: The EPA will move ahead this year with a litany of rules, including a tightening of the ozone standard, that critics contend will hold back the energy and power generation sectors of the economy and ultimately may cost tens of thousands of jobs.

The EPA last month released the final version of its controversial boiler "maximum achievable control technology" standard, better known as the Boiler MACT rule. It will greatly limit emissions from industrial boilers, heaters and similar sources.

"I don't think you're going to see a slowdown of regulations. Right now, the EPA is geared up to get them out the door," said Ken von Schaumburg, a D.C. lawyer who served as deputy general counsel at the EPA during the George W. Bush

## **EPA & Hydraulic Fracturing - Jan. 8**

administration. "The agenda is set. It's just a matter of how stringent the rules are going to be when they come out."

Another item at the top of the EPA hit list is greenhouse- gas emissions, viewed as a main contributor to climate change. The Obama administration has imposed a ban on new coal-fired plants, but likely will pursue equally onerous restrictions on existing plants.

Congressional Republicans fear the greenhouse gas limits eventually will cause great harm to broad swaths of the economy, including consumers, employers and homeowners who rely on power plants.

"It's not just coal plants that will be affected. Under the Clean Air Act, churches, schools, restaurants, hospitals and farms will eventually be regulated," according to a report issued by Republican members of the Senate Committee on Environment and Public Works.

### **Fracking fights**

The EPA also has its sights set on hydraulic fracturing, or "fracking," the controversial technique used to extract oil and natural gas from areas such as the Marcellus Shale that stretches across a number of Mid-Atlantic and Midwestern states. The process has transformed the American energy landscape and put the nation on track to free itself from dependence on foreign oil within the next two decades - an unimaginable scenario even a few years ago.

The EPA is in the midst of a massive study to determine whether the practice contributes to water pollution and contamination of local drinking sources. The report may be a precursor to sharp federal limits on fracking.

Environmentalists and many congressional Democrats are pushing for restrictions, even though Mr. Obama has expressed support for expanded domestic drilling.

Congressional Republicans remain skeptical of Mr. Obama's words and the EPA study. They have questioned the EPA's science given the agency's unsuccessful attempts to indict fracking as harmful to sources of drinking water.

Those Republicans ultimately have few viable options to slow down the agency's efforts.

"There have been numerous proposals put out by the Republican House to try and stymie these overreaching regulations, but they're not going to go anywhere," Mr. von Schaumburg said. Senate Majority Leader Harry Reid, Nevada Democrat, "is not going to ever put them on his agenda."

Republicans, buoyed by sweeping gains in the House in the 2010 elections, have tried over the past two years to rein in regulations and limit wasteful government investment into renewable fuels. The House last year passed several measures to stop what they say is the administration's "war on coal," and passed the "No More Solyndras Act," legislation meant to ensure that taxpayers never again lose hundreds of millions of dollars in failed investments in solar- or wind-power technology.

In the end, any significant energy legislation stands little chance of clearing the divided Congress. That leaves the White House and its EPA to write energy and environmental policy with limited input from the House and Senate.

"The administration is looking at the laws in existence, reinterpreting them and pushing them through the regulatory process much further than the law was ever intended," Mr. von Schaumburg said. "This administration is not letting Congress make law."

# **EPA & Hydraulic Fracturing - Jan. 8**

## **EPA fracking study may dodge some tough questions Tyler Star News - Online**

**01/08/2013**

PITTSBURGH (AP) — An ongoing U.S. Environmental Protection Agency study on natural gas drilling and its potential for groundwater contamination has gotten tentative praise so far from both industry and environmental groups.

Glenn Paulson, the EPA's science adviser, describes the project as "one of the most aggressive public outreach programs in EPA history."

The final report won't come out until late 2014. But a 275-page progress report was released in December and, for all its details, shows that the EPA doesn't plan to address one contentious issue — how often drinking water contamination might occur.

Congress ordered the EPA to study the potential effects of hydraulic fracturing, or fracking, which entails blasting a mixture of water, sand and hazardous chemicals at underground shale to release the gas or oil captured in the rock.

As a gas rush surged in parts of the Marcellus Shale region that underlies Pennsylvania, New York, Ohio and West Virginia concerns arose for the watershed that provides drinking water for 17 million people from Philadelphia to New York City.

For the study, the EPA is talking to experts from the industry, the environmental community, and universities. It's conducting its own research and using federal supercomputers to analyze the possibility of contamination.

In the report, the EPA describes what it is and isn't studying. The agency also indicates its final report won't provide a measurement of the likelihood of contamination — for example, once every 100,000 wells or once every 1,000.

The industry and many federal and state officials say fracking is safe when done properly, but environmental groups and some scientists contend the risk of contamination is too great.

Earthworks, an environmental group based in Washington, said it welcomes the EPA study but has concerns with plans not to include some probability of groundwater contamination in the final report.

The EPA had planned to do both computer simulations of water contamination and actual field tests at drilling sites. But the agency hasn't found a drilling company to partner with to test groundwater around a drilling site. That leaves the computer simulations. But the EPA said those won't be able to address the likelihood of contamination "occurring during actual field operations."

"In its inability to find a single company willing to test water quality before and after drilling and fracking, the EPA is being thwarted in perhaps the most important part of its study of fracking's impacts," Earthworks said in a statement.

"Computer simulations are not enough," Alan Septoff, a spokesman for Earthworks, said.

He said the EPA study and any future studies should consider the likelihood of water contamination.

The EPA did not immediately respond to requests for comment.

The progress report says the EPA is studying the possible impact on drinking water at several stages of the fracking

## **EPA & Hydraulic Fracturing - Jan. 8**

process: when water is drawn from reservoirs or underground sources and used for fracking; when a chemical mix is injected into the ground to break up rock; when wastewater from fracking is disposed of; how the drilling wells and wastewater-storage wells are constructed; and the potential for toxic fluids to migrate from deep underground to near-surface drinking water supplies.

The American Petroleum Institute, an industry lobby based in Washington, said in a statement that the progress report "is just the first step in a multi-year research study."

"More collaboration, continued transparency and stakeholder involvement are essential elements for any scientifically sound study, and we hope that the rest of this process remains open and any data released has the necessary context," API policy adviser Stephanie Meadows said.

Despite its concerns, Earthworks described the EPA study as a positive step.

"It represents a step towards EPA's first real scientific inquiry into the safety of fracking," the group said.



# **EPA & Hydraulic Fracturing - Jan. 8**

## **Methane leaking from fracking wells in Colorado and Utah raising concerns Examiner.com**

**01/08/2013**

A new study of hydraulic fracturing (fracking) wells in Colorado and Utah confirms an earlier study that methane is leaking from the wells at alarming rates. The study indicates as much as 9% of the methane gas is leaking into the air at those wells.

The study raises concerns about the environmental benefits of natural gas. A boom in gas production is transforming the US energy system and the economies of many communities.

The researchers, who both hold appointments with the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA) and the University of Colorado in Boulder, released a study in February 2012 that first sparked concern by suggesting that up to 4% of the methane produced at a field near Denver was escaping into the atmosphere.

Up to 9% of gas is leaking at the well study found

The research team reported new findings at an American Geophysical Union (AGU) meeting in San Francisco, California, last month. They presented new Colorado data that support the earlier work, as well as preliminary results from a field study in the Uinta Basin of Utah suggesting even higher rates of methane leakage — an eye-popping 9% of the total production.

That figure is nearly double the cumulative loss rates estimated from industry data. The gas industry disputes the claims as one would expect.

This has serious consequences for the entire gas industry nationwide. If methane, which is a much more potent and dangerous greenhouse gas than CO<sub>2</sub>, is leaking from fields across the country at similar rates, it could be offsetting much of the climate benefit of the ongoing shift from coal- to gas-fired plants for electricity generation. Jeff Tollefson wrote in "Nature" on January 2nd.

"We were expecting to see high methane levels, but I don't think anybody really comprehended the true magnitude of what we would see," says Colm Sweeney, who led the aerial component of the study as head of the aircraft program at NOAA's Earth System Research Laboratory in Boulder.

The NOAA researchers collected their data in February as part of a broader analysis of air pollution in the Uinta Basin, using ground-based equipment and an aircraft to make detailed measurements of various pollutants, including methane concentrations. They then used atmospheric modeling to calculate the level of methane emissions required to reach those concentrations, and then compared that with industry data on gas production to obtain the percentage escaping into the atmosphere through venting and leaks.

The results of this study build on an earlier study done in 2008 in the Denver-Julesburg basin in Colorado.

There is a great deal at stake here. A study published in April by scientists at the Environmental Defense Fund (EDF) and Princeton University in New Jersey suggests that shifting to natural gas from coal-fired generators has immediate climatic benefits as long as the cumulative leakage rate from natural-gas production is below 3.2%; the benefits accumulate over time and are even larger if the gas plants replace older coal plants.

If the numbers in the Colorado and Utah studies are correct, leakage of 4% to 9% would mean that coal fired plants

## **EPA & Hydraulic Fracturing - Jan. 8**

would actually have less of a carbon footprint than gas fired plants taking into account the methane lost at the wellhead. We might be making things worse while trying to make them better.

To see if that number holds up, the NOAA scientists are also taking part in a comprehensive assessment of US natural-gas emissions, conducted by the University of Texas at Austin and the EDF, with various industry partners. The researchers expect to submit the first of these studies for publication by February, and say that the others will be complete within a year.

So all eyes will be on that study to see if it supports the findings in the Colorado and Utah studies. The implications for America's energy industry are enormous. So are the risks to our climate if the results are found to be accurate nationwide. The wind and solar companies will be watching this as closely as the coal and gas industries—and EPA regulators.

If you like this article share it, Tweet it, or follow me on .

# **EPA & Hydraulic Fracturing - Jan. 8**

## **EPA fracking study may dodge some tough questions Gloversville Leader-Herald - Online**

**01/08/2013**

KEVIN BEGOS, Associated Press

PITTSBURGH (AP) — An ongoing U.S. Environmental Protection Agency study on natural gas drilling and its potential for groundwater contamination has gotten tentative praise so far from both industry and environmental groups.

Glenn Paulson, the EPA's science adviser, describes the project as "one of the most aggressive public outreach programs in EPA history."

The final report won't come out until late 2014. But a 275-page progress report was released in December and, for all its details, shows that the EPA doesn't plan to address one contentious issue — how often drinking water contamination might occur.

Congress ordered the EPA to study the potential effects of hydraulic fracturing, or fracking, which entails blasting a mixture of water, sand and hazardous chemicals at underground shale to release the gas or oil captured in the rock.

As a gas rush surged in parts of the Marcellus Shale region that underlies Pennsylvania, New York, Ohio and West Virginia concerns arose for the watershed that provides drinking water for 17 million people from Philadelphia to New York City.

For the study, the EPA is talking to experts from the industry, the environmental community, and universities. It's conducting its own research and using federal supercomputers to analyze the possibility of contamination.

In the report, the EPA describes what it is and isn't studying. The agency also indicates its final report won't provide a measurement of the likelihood of contamination — for example, once every 100,000 wells or once every 1,000.

The industry and many federal and state officials say fracking is safe when done properly, but environmental groups and some scientists contend the risk of contamination is too great.

Earthworks, an environmental group based in Washington, said it welcomes the EPA study but has concerns with plans not to include some probability of groundwater contamination in the final report.

The EPA had planned to do both computer simulations of water contamination and actual field tests at drilling sites. But the agency hasn't found a drilling company to partner with to test groundwater around a drilling site. That leaves the computer simulations. But the EPA said those won't be able to address the likelihood of contamination "occurring during actual field operations."

"In its inability to find a single company willing to test water quality before and after drilling and fracking, the EPA is being thwarted in perhaps the most important part of its study of fracking's impacts," Earthworks said in a statement.

"Computer simulations are not enough," Alan Septoff, a spokesman for Earthworks, said.

He said the EPA study and any future studies should consider the likelihood of water contamination.

The EPA did not immediately respond to requests for comment.

## **EPA & Hydraulic Fracturing - Jan. 8**

The progress report says the EPA is studying the possible impact on drinking water at several stages of the fracking process: when water is drawn from reservoirs or underground sources and used for fracking; when a chemical mix is injected into the ground to break up rock; when wastewater from fracking is disposed of; how the drilling wells and wastewater-storage wells are constructed; and the potential for toxic fluids to migrate from deep underground to near-surface drinking water supplies.

The American Petroleum Institute, an industry lobby based in Washington, said in a statement that the progress report "is just the first step in a multi-year research study."

"More collaboration, continued transparency and stakeholder involvement are essential elements for any scientifically sound study, and we hope that the rest of this process remains open and any data released has the necessary context," API policy adviser Stephanie Meadows said.

Despite its concerns, Earthworks described the EPA study as a positive step.

"It represents a step towards EPA's first real scientific inquiry into the safety of fracking," the group said.

—

Online:

<http://www.epa.gov/hfstudy/>

# **EPA & Hydraulic Fracturing - Jan. 8**

## **EPA fracking study may dodge some tough questions Yahoo! Finance**

**01/08/2013**

Federal study on hydraulic fracturing may answer some tough questions but dodge others

PITTSBURGH (AP) -- An ongoing U.S. Environmental Protection Agency study on natural gas drilling and its potential for groundwater contamination has gotten tentative praise so far from both industry and environmental groups.

Glenn Paulson, the EPA's science adviser, describes the project as "one of the most aggressive public outreach programs in EPA history."

The final report won't come out until late 2014. But a 275-page progress report was released in December and, for all its details, shows that the EPA doesn't plan to address one contentious issue — how often drinking water contamination might occur.

Congress ordered the EPA to study the potential effects of hydraulic fracturing, or fracking, which entails blasting a mixture of water, sand and hazardous chemicals at underground shale to release the gas or oil captured in the rock.

As a gas rush surged in parts of the Marcellus Shale region that underlies Pennsylvania, New York, Ohio and West Virginia concerns arose for the watershed that provides drinking water for 17 million people from Philadelphia to New York City.

For the study, the EPA is talking to experts from the industry, the environmental community, and universities. It's conducting its own research and using federal supercomputers to analyze the possibility of contamination.

In the report, the EPA describes what it is and isn't studying. The agency also indicates its final report won't provide a measurement of the likelihood of contamination — for example, once every 100,000 wells or once every 1,000.

The industry and many federal and state officials say fracking is safe when done properly, but environmental groups and some scientists contend the risk of contamination is too great.

Earthworks, an environmental group based in Washington, said it welcomes the EPA study but has concerns with plans not to include some probability of groundwater contamination in the final report.

The EPA had planned to do both computer simulations of water contamination and actual field tests at drilling sites. But the agency hasn't found a drilling company to partner with to test groundwater around a drilling site. That leaves the computer simulations. But the EPA said those won't be able to address the likelihood of contamination "occurring during actual field operations."

"In its inability to find a single company willing to test water quality before and after drilling and fracking, the EPA is being thwarted in perhaps the most important part of its study of fracking's impacts," Earthworks said in a statement.

"Computer simulations are not enough," Alan Septoff, a spokesman for Earthworks, said.

He said the EPA study and any future studies should consider the likelihood of water contamination.

The EPA did not immediately respond to requests for comment.

## **EPA & Hydraulic Fracturing - Jan. 8**

The progress report says the EPA is studying the possible impact on drinking water at several stages of the fracking process: when water is drawn from reservoirs or underground sources and used for fracking; when a chemical mix is injected into the ground to break up rock; when wastewater from fracking is disposed of; how the drilling wells and wastewater-storage wells are constructed; and the potential for toxic fluids to migrate from deep underground to near-surface drinking water supplies.

The American Petroleum Institute, an industry lobby based in Washington, said in a statement that the progress report "is just the first step in a multi-year research study."

"More collaboration, continued transparency and stakeholder involvement are essential elements for any scientifically sound study, and we hope that the rest of this process remains open and any data released has the necessary context," API policy adviser Stephanie Meadows said.

Despite its concerns, Earthworks described the EPA study as a positive step.

"It represents a step towards EPA's first real scientific inquiry into the safety of fracking," the group said.

Online:

<http://www.epa.gov/hfstudy/>

# **EPA & Hydraulic Fracturing - Jan. 8**

## **EPA fracking study may dodge some tough questions Wetzel Chronicle - Online**

**01/08/2013**

PITTSBURGH (AP) — An ongoing U.S. Environmental Protection Agency study on natural gas drilling and its potential for groundwater contamination has gotten tentative praise so far from both industry and environmental groups.

Glenn Paulson, the EPA's science adviser, describes the project as "one of the most aggressive public outreach programs in EPA history."

The final report won't come out until late 2014. But a 275-page progress report was released in December and, for all its details, shows that the EPA doesn't plan to address one contentious issue — how often drinking water contamination might occur.

Congress ordered the EPA to study the potential effects of hydraulic fracturing, or fracking, which entails blasting a mixture of water, sand and hazardous chemicals at underground shale to release the gas or oil captured in the rock.

As a gas rush surged in parts of the Marcellus Shale region that underlies Pennsylvania, New York, Ohio and West Virginia concerns arose for the watershed that provides drinking water for 17 million people from Philadelphia to New York City.

For the study, the EPA is talking to experts from the industry, the environmental community, and universities. It's conducting its own research and using federal supercomputers to analyze the possibility of contamination.

In the report, the EPA describes what it is and isn't studying. The agency also indicates its final report won't provide a measurement of the likelihood of contamination — for example, once every 100,000 wells or once every 1,000.

The industry and many federal and state officials say fracking is safe when done properly, but environmental groups and some scientists contend the risk of contamination is too great.

Earthworks, an environmental group based in Washington, said it welcomes the EPA study but has concerns with plans not to include some probability of groundwater contamination in the final report.

The EPA had planned to do both computer simulations of water contamination and actual field tests at drilling sites. But the agency hasn't found a drilling company to partner with to test groundwater around a drilling site. That leaves the computer simulations. But the EPA said those won't be able to address the likelihood of contamination "occurring during actual field operations."

"In its inability to find a single company willing to test water quality before and after drilling and fracking, the EPA is being thwarted in perhaps the most important part of its study of fracking's impacts," Earthworks said in a statement.

"Computer simulations are not enough," Alan Septoff, a spokesman for Earthworks, said.

He said the EPA study and any future studies should consider the likelihood of water contamination.

The EPA did not immediately respond to requests for comment.

The progress report says the EPA is studying the possible impact on drinking water at several stages of the fracking

## **EPA & Hydraulic Fracturing - Jan. 8**

process: when water is drawn from reservoirs or underground sources and used for fracking; when a chemical mix is injected into the ground to break up rock; when wastewater from fracking is disposed of; how the drilling wells and wastewater-storage wells are constructed; and the potential for toxic fluids to migrate from deep underground to near-surface drinking water supplies.

The American Petroleum Institute, an industry lobby based in Washington, said in a statement that the progress report "is just the first step in a multi-year research study."

"More collaboration, continued transparency and stakeholder involvement are essential elements for any scientifically sound study, and we hope that the rest of this process remains open and any data released has the necessary context," API policy adviser Stephanie Meadows said.

Despite its concerns, Earthworks described the EPA study as a positive step.

"It represents a step towards EPA's first real scientific inquiry into the safety of fracking," the group said.



# **EPA & Hydraulic Fracturing - Jan. 8**

## **Google hits on the fracking divide Electric Light and Power**

**01/08/2013**

FULL TEXT

Not so long ago, fracking was a technical term little known beyond the energy industry. Now it's coming to Hollywood, as the fierce battle between environmentalists and oil firms is played out in several forthcoming films.

Hydraulic fracturing, the controversial drilling technique also known as fracking, has lifted US energy output dramatically, despite warnings from critics who fear it pollutes water deep underground.

Any shift in public opinion could impact policy - and huge sums in energy spending - since drilling regulations are under review by the Obama administration and local officials around the country. The high stakes involve a range of issues from US energy independence, to protection of drinking water.

Both sides are using movies to try to win the debate, though actor Matt Damon says viewers should not assume the movie he stars in, "Promised Land," is "a rabid anti-fracking polemic."

In the film, Damon plays a gas company landman - an agent who buys or leases land - intent on drilling beneath a town where some residents are concerned about the perils of fracking. As the landman gets to know the townspeople, he suffers a crisis of conscience.

In an interview in Los Angeles, Damon said he worries that viewers will wrongly assume the film is one-sided and not see it. He declined to offer his personal view on fracking. "That's not the point. The point is that (the film) should start a conversation."

The Northern Irish director Phelim McAleer's documentary, "FrackNation," is an unabashedly pro-drilling mantra set to air next month on AXS TV, the cable network controlled by Dallas Mavericks owner and media mogul Mark Cuban.

McAleer views fracking as "the best thing ever," a potential saviour for the US economy, unless the forces he likes to call "Big Enviro" succeed in derailing it.

On the other side of the argument, HBO, the cable pay channel, could air a sequel to "Gasland," a scathing 2010 documentary from director Josh Fox, as early as next year.

The original film featured scenes of tap water erupting into flames and mobilised environmental groups against fracking, drawing full-throated rebuttals from an oil industry that says the process has never caused water problems.

Fox declined comment for this article.

Amid the showdown, both industry and anti-fracking camps have mounted major campaigns to sway hearts and minds.

"It could become the biggest environmental debate of our time," said Robert McNally, an energy policy expert and former White House adviser under George W Bush. "Hollywood is taking notice, and the industry will have its work cut out for it to defend fracking."

Nearly four out of 10 Americans surveyed by the Pew Research Center early this year said they knew nothing about

## **EPA & Hydraulic Fracturing - Jan. 8**

fracking. Other polls show most Americans familiar with the practice believe fracking offers economic benefits but requires tougher regulation.

This year, for the first time, US online searches for the term "fracking" became more popular than "climate change," Google data showed. Fracking has doubled on Google's popularity index since last year, and while "global warming" still draws more hits, the gap is narrowing.

Drinking water contamination is the leading environmental concern among Americans, according to Gallup polling data. A Bloomberg National Poll this month showed that 66 per cent of Americans want more fracking regulation, up from 56 per cent in September.

'Pounding the zone'

Whether "Promised Land" will shift public opinion is uncertain. But films with environmental themes often can, according to Joseph Cappella, a professor of communications at the University of Pennsylvania.

Past examples include Al Gore's "An Inconvenient Truth" on climate change, and "Erin Brockovich," a dramatisation of real events in which actress Julia Roberts played a legal clerk who uncovers water contamination by a California power company.

Ahead of the release of "Promised Land," some within the oil industry are already reading the film's script online.

"Look, I don't want to whistle past the graveyard. This film is going to be a challenge, and we'll just have to see how it does on opening weekend," said Chris Tucker of pro-drilling group Energy In Depth (EID), which is funded by industry. "In terms of popularisation of the issue, it will have an effect."

The oil industry wants to avoid another blow like the one it took from Fox's 2010 "Gasland" film. Google search data shows online interest in fracking surged immediately afterwards.

For three years, Tucker has been working with other communications experts, "pounding the zone with facts" to counter what he calls false claims in "Gasland" and to promote drilling.

Films like "Promised Land" will get people curious and send them searching online, said Tucker, where he worries the term 'fracking' gets a bad rap.

"People will go home and Google it, and the other side does really well on Google," he said.

EID released its own pro-drilling film, "Truthland," this year, dubbing it "the factual alternative to Gasland."

Losing PR battle?

In some ways, the film blitz may be behind the times. Fracking has already come to dominate US drilling over the last half-decade: Onshore rigs doing so-called unconventional drilling account for nearly two-thirds of the total.

Tucker and industry officials are regulars at conferences, in newspaper op-ed articles, and on TV to defend drilling.

On the environmentalist side, Fox travels widely to lead anti-fracking rallies, sometimes rousing crowds by playing a banjo, which is also featured in the Gasland soundtrack. He has enlisted help from artists including Yoko Ono and Sean Lennon.

## **EPA & Hydraulic Fracturing - Jan. 8**

"The lesson of 'Gasland' is that public perception is a very big part of the equation," said Jonathan Wood, a political risk analyst at London-based Control Risks, whose clients include oil companies.

In a report this month, Wood wrote that the industry has "largely failed to appreciate social and political risks, and has repeatedly been caught off guard by the sophistication, speed and influence of anti-fracking activists."

Hydraulic fracturing entails pumping water laced with chemicals and sand at high pressure into shale rock formations to break them up and unleash hydrocarbons.

The minerals are trapped thousands of feet below water tables, but critics worry that fracking fluids or hydrocarbons can still leak into water tables from wells, or above ground. Among their other concerns: fracking-related earthquakes, and growing dependence on fossil fuels.

The United States now rivals Russia as the world's top gas producer, in large part due to fracking, and has stemmed a long decline in oil output, which stands at an 18-year high near 7 million barrels a day.

So far, the Obama administration has cautiously endorsed the new drilling, but the US Department of Interior is working on new fracking rules on public lands starting next year.

Some drillers have faced fracking-related fines for water contamination due to spilled fracking fluid. Last year, after sampling water in rural Pavillion, Wyoming, the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) presented the first-ever US government finding of a potential link between fracking and water contamination.

More broadly, however, the EPA condones fracking on safety grounds. But unlike the growing consensus among climate scientists linking global warming and industrial activity, there is no consensus that fracking poses a danger. Unconventional drilling has surged only over the last half decade.

The EPA will release an in-depth study on fracking's potential impacts on water supplies in 2014.

Tough economic times can widen support for drilling. A national Gallup poll this year showed that more Americans favored prioritising economic growth over the protection of the environment (49 per cent versus 41 per cent).

That's a reversal from 2007, when 55 per cent favored environmental protection.

Cuban is betting the hot potato issue will draw viewers to "FrackNation" on his cable channel.

"Op-Ed-umentaries like this are supposed to make people think about the topic, which is always a good thing," he said.

Editor's note: Promised Land was released on January 4 in the US. It was the tenth highest grossing film in its first weekend, bringing in around \$4.3 million.

This article was originally published by Reuters.